United Nations A/HRC/33/26

General Assembly

Distr.: General
3 August 2016

Original: English

Human Rights Council
Thirty-third session
Agenda items 2 and 3
Annual report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and reports of the Office of the High Commissioner and the Secretary-General

Promotion and protection of all human rights, civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights, including the right to development

Outcome of the high-level panel discussion on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the Human Rights Council

Summary report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights

Summary

The present report is submitted pursuant to Human Rights Council decision 31/115. It provides a summary of the high-level panel discussion on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the Human Rights Council, focused on its achievements and challenges, held on 13 June 2016, during the thirty-second session of the Council.

GE.16-13360(E)

1613360

Please recycle

I. Introduction

1. Pursuant to its decision 31/115, the Human Rights Council held a high-level panel discussion on 13 June 2016 on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the Human Rights Council, focused on its achievements and challenges.

2. The panel discussion was chaired by the President of the Human Rights Council, Choi Kyonglim. It opened with statements by the Deputy Secretary-General, Jan Eliasson, and the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, Zeid Ra'ad Al Hussein.

3. The meeting provided an opportunity for States, international organizations and other relevant stakeholders to underline and reiterate the commitment to the universal promotion and protection of human rights for all, and to reflect on the achievements and challenges of the Human Rights Council.

4. The panel was moderated by the Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights, Kate Gilmore. The panellists included the nine former presidents of the Human Rights Council: Joachim Rücker (Germany), Baudelaire Ndong Ella (Gabon), Remigiusz Achilles Henczel (Poland), Laura Dupuy Lasserre (Uruguay), Sihasak Phuangketkeow (Thailand), Alex Van Meeuwen (Belgium), Martin I. Uhomoibhi (Nigeria), Doru Costea (Romania) and Luis Alfonso de Alba (Mexico) (by video message); as well as former Special Rapporteur on the human right to safe drinking water and sanitation, Catarina de Albuquerque, and United Nations Advocate at Human Rights Watch, Laila Matar.

II. Opening session

5. The President of the Human Rights Council noted in his opening remarks that, since its first session 10 years ago, the Council's work in promoting and protecting human rights had indeed led to significant results worldwide, but the Council was still young and much work still remained for it to reach its full potential. The victims and the vulnerable looked to the Council for protection and the world pleaded with it to find solutions to grave situations. Every person deserved to fully enjoy their human rights. As the world's premier body on human rights it was the Council's duty to make that a reality.

6. The Deputy Secretary-General highlighted the universal periodic review, which shone a light on all corners of the world and presented, for the first time, a picture of the global state of human rights. The Council's special procedures had played a pivotal role in highlighting specific human rights issues around the globe and had helped shape the Council's agenda to cover an impressive breadth of themes. They fostered critical national discourse on human rights and also acted as early warning and action mechanisms. The Council also played a role in sounding alarm bells ahead of impending or worsening crises, drawing global attention to deteriorating situations through its special sessions, seeking urgent responses and reminding States to fulfil their human rights obligations by placing victims in the centre. The Council was also a force for responding to protracted crises. Its commissions of inquiries and fact-finding missions underscored the need for accountability and stressed the importance of combating impunity and ensuring justice. The Council had amplified the vital voice of civil society and the grassroots activists who complemented its own work. Finally, its discussions in Geneva had stimulated debates in the Security Council and the General Assembly in New York, strengthening the links between peace and security, development, and human rights – the three pillars of the United Nations.

7. However, he noted these were troubled times and it was not possible to say that the work was done. Tensions and deadly conflicts were on the rise, often exposing blatant disregard for human rights and international humanitarian law. The number of refugees and displaced persons was at an all-time high – over 60 million people: they were desperately seeking safety and a better life, and yet often faced closed borders, walls and hostility. Terrorism and violent extremism were serious threats to international peace and security. Terrorists and violent extremist groups wanted to create fear, which in turn could lead to polarization and division in societies and thus undermine the fundamental truth of the equal worth of all human beings. He noted, however, that there were situations where abuses were committed under the banner of fighting terrorist groups. Also, the space for civil society and the media was shrinking in many parts of the world and human rights defenders often faced threats and violence. At the same time, perpetrators of human rights violations, more often than not, went free, leaving victims to struggle for decades for accountability. Another disturbing reality was the continued discrimination and violence against women and girls everywhere. Unprecedented levels of inequalities within and between nations reminded of the need to place advancement of economic and social rights on a par with civil and political rights. Deep social and economic crises and injustices and the devastating effects of climate change contributed to leaving the human rights promise of the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights unfulfilled for far too many people around the world.

8. Those negative trends must be reversed and human rights violations must be prevented. The Deputy Secretary-General highlighted some of the available tools, including the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the commitment therein to leave no one behind and start with those furthest behind, as well as the Secretary-General's ground-breaking Human Rights Up Front Initiative, based on promoting early warning, on principled and coordinated United Nations action and on closer engagement with Member States in a spirit of dialogue, transparency and cooperation. Finally, there must be a commitment to adopt human rights-based approaches to development that builds on free, active and meaningful participation, accountability, non-discrimination in all areas, including sexual orientation, equality and the empowerment of all.

9. The United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights said that the Council had set up unprecedented processes for scrutiny of human rights issues and situations. It had initiated vital investigations into new crises and chronic violations and formulated crucial recommendations. The Council's embrace of civil society was unmatched by any forum in the United Nations system, which contributed greatly to the Council's relevance. As the world's most authoritative forum on human rights, it was vital that the Council intensified its focus on improving the implementation of human rights commitments on the ground to ensure that the Council's work became much more consequential. Looking ahead to the next 10 years, he expressed hope that all actors would be addressing the root causes of human rights violations much more forcefully.

10. Members of the Council needed to ensure that they consistently promoted all human rights within their own countries. They could also ensure that their development assistance policies worked to encourage other States to implement the recommendations of the human rights mechanisms, and to uphold human rights. The Council could take a leadership role in the drive for much more systematic follow-up to recommendations. On that point, his Office would be publishing good practices on coordinated national follow-up to human rights recommendations, which he hoped would inspire all Member States.

III. Summary of the panel discussion

11. Opening the panel as moderator, the Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights said that the session was unprecedented in a number of ways, including because of the full participation of representatives from all 193 States Members of the United Nations. She introduced the former Presidents of the Human Rights Council as participants in the panel discussion. She invited the panellists to appraise the Human Rights Council.

A. Contributions of panellists

12. Mr. de Alba, in a video message, highlighted the space opened up by the Council for the participation and interaction of different governmental and non-governmental actors with the special procedures and called for its reinforcement. The universal periodic review mechanism had been the new tool that had allowed the Council to bring a broader, more integrated and more balanced vision to human rights, and he called upon the Council to ensure that the universal periodic review continued to evolve into a more in-depth exercise. The relationship with the special procedures should be strengthened and the Council should begin an exercise to become more focused, as the number of special procedures had increased excessively and not necessarily in a complementary manner. Finally, he stressed the need for the Council's relationship with the General Assembly and other United Nations bodies to evolve into that which it was originally intended, namely, that the Council was actually a responsible and last resort body and that its decisions were not challenged in the General Assembly, let alone by the Third Committee. That relationship with the Assembly, a relationship that should also extend to the Security Council and other organs, was one of the main outstanding tasks of the Council. States also needed to regain the sense of individual responsibility in the Council, rather than resorting increasingly to group positions and defensive attitudes.

13. Mr. Costea noted that the universal periodic review was a real accomplishment of the Council, although it could work better with the support of governments. When asked about the worst moment during his presidency, he referred to the challenges emanating from the application of United Nations documentation rules to the documents for the universal periodic review for the first time.

14. Ms. Dupuy Lasserre recalled that one of the messages that had emerged from the first high-level panel on human rights mainstreaming was how working on respecting women's rights would lift millions out of poverty. That was a strong message, which must be heard. She hoped that through the universal implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals no one would be left behind and that the international community would combat violence against women and all forms of discrimination, among other things. It was those goals that brought together all human rights, including the right to development and fundamental freedoms, which allowed the growth of inclusive and democratic societies.

15. Mr. Uhomoibhi said that one of the most enduring attributes of human rights was their universality. In comparison with the Commission on Human Rights, the Council upheld that principle, ensuring that the issues that it discussed were truly global and universal and that everyone, including civil society, was allowed to participate and be a part of the process.

16. Ms. Matar said that the Council represented a hope for victims of human rights abuses all around the world. Civil society had been a part of some of the most successful outcomes of the Council, bringing in information and working closely with delegations to come up with creative solutions. However, challenges remained to civil society space and its place at the table. Acts of intimidation and reprisals against human rights defenders that

engaged with the Council and its mechanisms unfortunately continued and the global crackdown on civil society carried on. She pointed out that a prominent human rights defender who attended the Council many times had been arrested on that very same day.

17. Mr. Rücker said the Council did well in addressing freedoms of expression and of assembly and had become the central political forum for addressing human rights worldwide, including through the universal periodic review. When looking back at the previous 10 years, there were reasons to be proud and reasons not to be satisfied. When he had taken over the presidency he had identified three topics to be focused on: strengthening the relationship between New York and Geneva, including cooperation between the Human Rights Council and the Security Council; the need to become more efficient in view of tremendous inflation of the agenda of the Human Rights Council; and the need to have more impact on the ground.

18. Mr. Henczel said that the universal periodic review was a success, as the only mechanism that examined the human rights in all Member States in an equal manner. The Council should focus even more closely on implementation of the recommendations ensuing from the universal periodic review. Unsatisfactory progress of implementation was often the result of insufficient funds, especially in the case of the least developed countries. Recommendations submitted to those countries that required large investment should be directly linked to pledges of finance or technical assistance. The High Commissioner for Human Rights should highlight more clearly the assessment of the level of implementation of accepted recommendations. It could perhaps issue an implementation assessment report ahead of the review of every State.

19. Mr. Ndong Ella said that the Council now enjoyed a degree of authority, dignity and credibility. Most of the topics that were not resolved in the Security Council were dealt with by the Human Rights Council. During his mandate, with the permanent members of the Security Council and emerging States as members of the Human Rights Council, there had been a threat of politicization, polarization and confrontation. However, a constructive dialogue had been achieved. The Council was a victim of its own success in terms of the increasing number of meetings and resolutions. There was a need for a discussion with the Administrative and Budgetary Committee regarding the insufficient funding for the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights for the implementation of Council mandates.

20. Mr. Van Meeuwen stressed that to outsiders it often seemed that the Council sought agreement and consensus at any cost, even at the cost of lowering ambition and betraying its own mission. However, it was important to look into the political context in which the Council operated, and seeking consensus often brought about a lot of political agreement. There had been a situation when the Council had been at a stalemate for about 48 hours and tense moments that could even have jeopardized the human rights system itself, but the Council managed to succeed with the support of the Secretariat.

21. Ms. de Albuquerque recalled one of the achievements of the Council – the adoption of the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, over whose negotiations she had presided. As a Special Rapporteur, it was very rewarding to hear in interactive dialogues of the progress reported by some countries in implementation at the national level of recommendations of the Special Rapporteurs in the context of their country missions. Some of the challenges included not being allowed to visit certain countries, the lack of resources and the lack of follow-up and implementation of recommendations. She also regretted the lack of support to human rights by some members of the United Nations family.

22. Mr. Phuangketkeow recalled the challenges during the review of the Human Rights Council in 2010-2011 over which he presided. At first there had been no agreement on the scope of the review, until it was decided that everything would remain on the table and nothing would be agreed until everything was agreed. The outcome document represented the limited areas of agreement that States had been ready to reach. The success of the Council should not be measured by the number of resolutions, but by the impact it made on the ground and to what degree it addressed the lives of people. A key question during the review process was how to do better in addressing urgent situations and which tools, in addition to special sessions, it could use to engage the concerned country early on, voluntarily and constructively. The Council had considered voluntary briefings by the country concerned, closed-door sessions and informal dialogue with the country concerned. However, those formats could not be agreed upon because one side wanted to require the consent of the country concerned, while the other wanted not to have that requirement and have an automatic trigger mechanism. The conversation on how to deal with urgent situations was important to the credibility of the Council and should continue between now and the next review of the Council.

B. Interactive discussion

23. During the plenary discussion, the following States and other stakeholders delivered statements:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Bangladesh, China (on behalf of a group of countries), Cuba (on behalf of a like-minded group of countries), Ecuador, Morocco (on behalf of International Organization of la Francophonie), Portugal, Qatar (on behalf of the Arab Group), Saudi Arabia, South Africa (on behalf of the African Group), Switzerland (on behalf of a group of countries), the United Arab Emirates, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (on behalf of a group of countries) and Viet Nam (on behalf of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Brazil (on behalf of the Community of Portuguese Language-speaking Countries), Costa Rica (on behalf of a group of countries), the Dominican Republic (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Egypt (on behalf of a group of countries), Honduras, Iceland (on behalf of the Group of Nordic Countries), Ireland (on behalf of a group of countries), Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation) and Rwanda (on behalf of a group of countries);

(c) Representatives of intergovernmental organizations: the European Union;

(d) Representatives of national human rights institutions: the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions;

(e) Representatives of non-governmental organizations: the Arab Commission for Human Rights, CIVICUS – World Alliance for Citizen Participation (on behalf of a group of non-governmental organizations), the International Service for Human Rights (on behalf of a group of non-governmental organizations) and Rencontre Africaine pour la defense des droits de l'homme;

(f) Representatives of other entities: the International Committee of the Red Cross.

24. A number of additional participants requested the floor during the panel discussion but could not deliver their statements owing to a lack of time:

(a) Representatives of States: Afghanistan, Albania, Armenia, Australia, Bahamas, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, the Czech Republic, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Gabon, Georgia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Malaysia, Maldives, Monaco, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, the Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sudan, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam and Zambia;

(b) Representatives of intergovernmental organizations: the Council of Europe, the International Development Law Organization and the World Trade Organization;

(c) Representatives of non-governmental organizations: American Association of Jurists, China NGO Network for International Exchanges, Indian Council of South America, Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, Organisation internationale pour les pays les moins avances, Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, United Nations Watch and Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik.

25. Many speakers highlighted the achievements of the Council, such as: the enhancement of the international human rights system, including through special procedures and the universal periodic review; raising global awareness of human rights and mainstreaming human rights within the United Nations system; drawing attention to emerging human rights situations; developing cooperation with national human rights institutions; and providing a space for civil society and human rights defenders to be heard.

26. Speakers welcomed the role of the Council in advancing human rights and fundamental freedoms through constructive dialogue. Many speakers stressed the need to respect the principles of universality, impartiality, objectivity, non-selectiveness, transparency, constructive dialogue and cooperation within the work of the Council. They also called for the promotion of all human rights and fundamental freedoms in an equal and balanced manner, including the right to development. In that regard, speakers commended the universal periodic review, which benefited from the participation of all Member States and the implementation of its recommendations on the ground. Speakers also welcomed the efforts of the Council to offer technical cooperation and capacity-building for human rights, particularly to developing countries, with the support of the Office of the High Commissioner. They also called on the Council to promote a range of other issues, such as human rights education and training, the rule of law and multilingualism.

27. Various speakers addressed issues relating to institution-building, including: the review of the subsidiary relationship of the Council with the General Assembly in 2021; preserving the mandate of the Council in accordance with General Assembly resolution 60/251; promoting the commitment of States members of the Council to uphold the highest standards of human rights, cooperate with the Council and its mechanisms, and refrain from abusing procedural devices; focusing more attention on the implementation of recommendations and decisions of the Council and its mechanisms; developing the interaction of the Council with the treaty bodies; and taking steps to ensure that the volume of work did not undermine the substantive impact of the Council.

28. Several speakers addressed issues related to the work of the Council with civil society, including: expanding the participation of national human rights institutions; enhancing the participation of civil society and implementing a comprehensive policy on

intimidations and reprisals against those cooperating with the Council; providing more space for civil society to organize events on the margins of the Council; promoting the participation of a greater number of non-governmental organizations in the Council; and advancing constructive dialogue.

29. Several speakers highlighted the need for the Council to respond adequately to situations on the ground and focus more attention on early warning and prevention of situations that can lead to mass atrocity crimes, including genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity. In that regard, they noted the utility of information provided by the High Commissioner, special procedure mandate holders, the treaty bodies and civil society. Some speakers called on the Council to commit to addressing human rights situations raised by the Secretary-General, the High Commissioner or the special procedure mandate holders, and addressing other human rights situations based on objective criteria. They also called for accountability for human rights violations to be upheld.

C. Responses and concluding remarks

30. The moderator noted that, during the discussion it had been noted that the performance of the Council in some areas seemed to have been reasonable and there had been no mention of any failure. The Council had been encouraged to do better in emergencies and in prevention. There had been a call for expansion of civil society space. Comments had been made on the struggle against impunity, but also encouragement had been given for much greater education and promotion of human rights. Some concerns had also been expressed about the performance of the Council with regard to balance, universality and indivisibility. The question was where the Council should improve.

31. Ms. Dupuy Lasserre said it was necessary to go beyond the discourse of cultural diversity versus human rights; cultural diversity could not be invoked to undermine those rights that were inherent to all people. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights is an imperative norm in international law and therefore the Council must never passively accept acts of slavery, violence against women, hate crimes and so on. The Council had to act preventively and generate national capacity and the necessary political will.

32. Mr. Henczel stressed that everything necessary must be done to save the universality of the universal periodic review mechanism and to avoid the existing tendency towards bilateralization of the process; territorial disputes, for example, should not be raised during the review. The Office of the High Commissioner and the Council should confront the growing workload, including the growing number of panels, debates and resolutions, which most delegations were not able to follow, particularly small and medium-sized missions in Geneva.

33. Mr. Uhomoibhi called on the Council to strengthen its role in preventing crises. As there was no alternative to the Human Rights Council, a world without the Council could not be contemplated. The Council must stand out as a global moral compass and, as a last bastion for the promotion and protection of human rights, it must not be ambushed for political purposes or vested interests. The moment that it compromised its objectivity, impartiality and neutrality, the Council would lose its credibility.

34. Mr. Van Meeuwen said that the political context in the final days of the previous Commission on Human Rights had been extremely bad. The Council preserved the universality of the human rights conventions and established itself in a central position on human rights. It was important to focus on the core task of the Council, being effective on the ground. The universal periodic review delivered results and was a concrete contribution of the Council to improving effectiveness on the ground. The biggest challenge for the

Council was responding to crisis situations. It was also important to keep and develop the role of civil society in the Council and outside. In that regard, what was happening in many places on the ground was of significant concern.

35. Mr. Ndong Ella said it was vital for civil society to continue to play a key role in the Human Rights Council. Civil society had a great impact because it could warn the Council about situations of which the Council was not previously aware. The integrity and safety of civil society had to be upheld. In that regard, the international community often condemned reprisals against and intimidation of civil society representatives. It was important to understand that the Council dealt with violations of human rights in States. However, it was difficult for the Council to address cases in which non-State actors were involved. The Council should reflect on how to address such cases in the future. He asked how a commission of inquiry mandated by the Council could investigate violations committed by Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant. It was also important for the Council to work with regional human rights bodies. He stressed the need for technical assistance, noting that, during his mandate, he had dealt with countries in post-conflict situations, which had had difficulties in accepting the visit of Special Rapporteurs or commissions of inquiry. Instead of taking a confrontational approach, the key was to promote education on human rights and to have a pedagogic approach, stressing technical assistance and cooperation.

36. Ms. de Albuquerque said that she wished that the Council had a traffic-light system signalling green, yellow or red to indicate the degree to which a country implemented human rights recommendations. More attention should be paid to economic, social and cultural rights, including in the context of the universal periodic review, special sessions of the Council and commissions of inquiry, as violations of those rights were often root causes of conflicts. She also called for more space for independent bodies. When Special Rapporteurs interacted with the Council and reported on their country visits, it was important that the voices of civil society would be heard. She expressed support for cooperation with Member States to make sure that human rights were universally implemented. However, she added that, when being confronted with violations of human rights, there were moments when a spade had to be called a spade, in order to trigger action and generate positive impact.

37. Mr. Costea said that the Council should do more to use its comprehensive box of tools to their full potential. The Council should be more confident in itself and in its achievements. He noted the importance of civil society and its role in the Council. He encouraged dialogue and confidence-building measures between civil society organizations and governments at the national and international levels. Effectiveness and prevention were key issues.

38. Ms. Matar said that, while it was correctly noted that the Council was not in a formal review process, the Council could be a learning institution that interrogated its own practices. She concurred that the Council had pervasive selectivity, but expressed concern that too often selectivity was used as an excuse to address fewer countries, rather than more, and a handful of powerful countries and their allies with some of the most critical human rights situations were able to avoid scrutiny. She noted that there were excellent suggestions from the floor on how the Council could circumvent its own political nature, by creating objective criteria and thresholds to guide decision-making processes around which to take action on country situations or thematic issues at any given time. She also addressed the issue of the standards for membership in the Council. In that regard, she called for the improvement of the process for electing members of the Council by encouraging more competition, having Member States articulate clear human rights-centred criteria for their votes, and candidates articulate how they would progressively enhance human rights in their countries and what criteria for cooperation with special procedures and United Nations mechanisms at large they would follow during their membership.

39. Mr. Phuangketkeow shared the concern raised about politicization, but noted that politics would always be a part of the Council simply because it was composed of States. There were different views of human rights and, therefore, mutual respect and dialogue were essential in the Council. The conversations within the Council must also include non-governmental organizations. There was also a need to follow-up on the resolutions and ensure their implementation on the ground. The number of armed conflicts had declined, but their severity and impact on civilians had increased. The Council would be addressing more and more human rights violations in the context of armed conflict. Therefore, it was important to consider the status of the Council, in view of human rights being one of the three pillars of the United Nations. The relationship with the Security Council was also important in that context; although it was a sensitive issue, it should be considered so that the Council could have an impact on the lives of people.

40. Mr. Rücker said that efficiency, effectiveness and New York-Geneva relations were among the solvable problems. Participants in the discussion had made it very clear that effectiveness with regard to the impact on the ground was the most important issue. The Council had tremendous assets in that regard, including the participation of civil society, which must be protected. The universal periodic review was another asset and the process needed to be strengthened and streamlined and to have indicators for the implementation of recommendations. The membership of the Council was a political issue, but civil society provided tools to track what States had promised and how they had performed in the Council, and that should play a role in elections of new Members to the Council. A number of initiatives for improving efficiency could be undertaken within the framework of the institution-building package, including measures to reduce the number of resolutions adopted by the Council. At the next review of the Council, Member States should consider placing the Council on an equal footing with the security and peace pillar and the development pillar by making the Human Rights Council a principal organ in the United Nations system.

41. Mr. Ndong Ella said that more needed to be done to strengthen synergies between Geneva and New York. In that context, issues that had already been addressed in Geneva, such as the issue of reprisals dealt with by the Council in its resolution 24/24, should not be seized by the Third Committee in New York. In that regard, it was particularly important to advance the proposal of making the Council a truly independent body.

42. Ms. de Albuquerque said that States must come forward and support the Office of the High Commissioner with more resources in order to respond to the needs expressed and deliver on human rights education and making the Council more accessible to the public. The Office should work more at the national level, including with national human rights institutions and civil society organizations. In addition, non-governmental organizations and special procedures should be involved in the process of the selection of new mandate holders.

43. Concluding the discussion, the moderator noted that the greatest gift of the Human Rights Council to the world was a Council that stood up unequivocally for the principles of human rights for all, without excluding anyone and for the benefit of all.